



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

two forces of Love and Strife. Those whose minds dwell upon the process by which the world is built, dwell upon the strife by which the inappropriate variations of creatures are extirpated. But the struggle from which the permanent and vital forms arise serves only to throw into intenser relief the peculiar bond by which the forms themselves are allied. The evils against which they continually fought are forgotten, in that relationship to past and future which is felt in the joy of victory, in the natural piety which links together the successive types. The history of humanity is like a life which a man should spend in a continual prayer of thanksgiving, the outpouring of ecstasy purchased at the price of inward conflict. As he prays he tells a rosary. The beads represent the successive ideals of mankind. As each portion of his prayer is said, as each new ideal is lived and its use is over, he pushes down a bead with his fingers. The name of the thread on which the beads are strung is Love.

S. ALEXANDER.

WHAT ATTITUDE SHOULD THE PULPIT TAKE TO THE LABOR PROBLEM?

A FEW years ago wide-spread attention was called to the fact that the pulpit had actually invaded Wall Street. Business men in that great centre of trade and commerce had been attending religious services day after day. It was at the time of Lent. A well-known preacher from New England had visited their city of New York and was proclaiming the sublime doctrines of the Cross right at the very gates of the world's colossal money-market. Trinity Church, which stands just at the head of that famous thoroughfare, was said to be drawing its congregations from the Stock Exchange.

It was a novel and striking experiment. The pulpit had taken its stand once more in the market-place and established its right to be heard. Men whose only care had been to buy and sell and get gain, had been drawn away from their imme-

diat pursuits, and been led to turn aside and think for a while on what was said to them of the eternal verities of religion. It almost seemed as though the life of the spirit was to regain its ascendancy in the world. The Church had gone out to men, inasmuch as men would not come to the Church.

But there is another step to be taken. It is not enough to call men's thoughts away for an interval from their immediate cares. It does not make men religious just to dwell on those higher truths. They go back to their occupations and come under the influence of the same old interests. It is of much greater concern to discover how we can bring those truths to bear on the lives of men *just where they are*. To be "Heirs of God," "Seekers after Righteousness," or "Followers of the Cross," implies not only attending a religious service or having certain deep religious feelings, but also the way a person acts and the spirit he displays as a business man while transacting his affairs on the floor of the Exchange. Until this is thoroughly understood, we cannot assume that the world has come once more under the sway of religious influences. We have only taken the first step when we have drawn men's thoughts away for a time from the life of the world to the life of the spirit. What is to be done when they go back again into the world? We accomplish little, simply by taking the attitude of devotion for a given occasion. By doing this we may only throw an air of consecration over what is glaringly, if not defiantly, secular. We do not exert a religious influence on a political convention, for example, by opening it with prayer, when it is quite certain that the proceedings afterwards will be in utter indifference to the whole spirit of that aspiration. Religion should tell a man how he should conduct himself as a carpenter if he is a carpenter, as a ward delegate to a primary meeting if that is his immediate occupation, or as a bank president if he is a bank president. It should speak to the employer of labor, and have something to say as to the way he should deal with the hundreds and thousands of men and women whose efforts are being consumed day by day under his guidance and authority. The pulpit should have its influence on Trades-Unions, and be on the

platform with the labor agitator. It should in some manner go into the City Councils. It should manage to sit with the Board of Directors that conduct the affairs of the banks, railways, and other great corporations. It will not do for the world to be actuated by one motive or principle on the week-day, and by another on Sunday. If it comes to be understood that a man can enter into the spirit of a religious service, practically undisturbed in mind by his previous conduct in his business relations as wage-earner or employer,—then it would imply that the pulpit was not to influence men in their lives, but only to play on their religious emotions. The clergy would not for a moment be willing to accept so inferior a construction of their office. They are only too anxious over the widening chasm between the week-day and Sunday.

It would be idle, therefore, to dwell on the necessity of taking some very positive measures for meeting the difficulty. We are met rather with the embarrassing query, How is it to be done? How shall we as the clergy, or as ethical lecturers, exert an influence on the Social Problem?

It would be of no avail for us in the spirit of loyalty to our ideals, to make suggestions or pour forth denunciations, if we knew that the people who have been listening to us,—practical, hard-headed business men,—would shrug their shoulders and say: "It is all very good, what you say; but, after all, it cannot be done; it is beautiful, but really you do not know the world." It may be said, and said truly to us: "You never sat at a Bank-Directors' meeting; you never belonged to a Trades-Union. What do you know about a boycott or a lock-out? What have you ever had to do with settling questions between laborer and employer? How do you know that we would not make the conditions worse rather than better, and involve ourselves in a still greater tangle of difficulty, if we acted on your suggestions?"

It is just this perplexity which stares us in the face. How can we as the clergy escape the charge of being "dreamers" and "theorists," when we speak on practical affairs? We are told that we ought to talk about what interests or concerns the life of the people. When we do this,

however, we are at once reminded that we are attempting it in the wrong way and speaking on matters we know nothing about. There would be no purpose in offering suggestions, if men will not listen to them. It would be only a waste of effort to pour forth our judgments unless we can make them heard. Reforms and changes do take place in political life and in the business world. But the men of affairs have a different way of going about it. Perhaps they are to some extent justified in their dislike of "clergymen's reforms."

The reason why the clergy help so little or none at all in such movements, is that we have not ourselves been down in the ranks to share in the actual work ; and so we have not been able to discover where are the lines of least resistance along which to urge men's action. People do want higher methods and better conditions. But they do not like to go in a round-about way to establish them. They desire to be "business-like" in measures of this kind, as well as everywhere else. It is essential, therefore, if we are to have any influence on the outside world in this direction, that we should know thoroughly what we are talking about, so as not to make utterly impracticable suggestions.

The first need, therefore, for us is that we leave our studies and libraries for the time, and step forth into direct contact with what is being done in the week-day by the average world. It would be well for us to take the attitude of a learner for a while. We have done too much preaching. We should put questions rather than give advice. We ought to attend the mass-meetings of the working-class, to mingle with the labor element in their May-day or September festival. It would be wise for us to understand the Banking System before we undertake to say what is right and what is wrong in the management of a Bank. We should talk with business men and become acquainted with their kind of work ; we should let them instruct us on the affairs of the world. It would be well for us to know what Trades-Unions are trying to do, before we undertake to warn the wage-earners of the evils of Trades-Unionism. If labor leaders visit our city we should go and listen to their addresses, and if possible

become acquainted with them personally. We should visit political conventions, attend business men's clubs, climb the stairs of tenement-houses, be present at the meetings of Socialists, Single-Tax Leagues, and Nationalists. We cannot get this kind of knowledge altogether out of books. It is absolutely essential that we mingle with human life and come in direct connection with what agitates other people. If we are going to exert a religious influence on business men, we should study the Silver Question as well as Theology. If we care to be of help to the working-class, we should master the principles of the labor organizations as well as the history of the Church. We are to do this, however, not in the first place in order to solve the difficulties involved in those problems, but rather so that we can meet the people we care to help, on the plane of *their* interests, instead of asking them to come to the special plane of *our* interests.

What may be liable to bring the clergymen's reforms into disrepute, is the inclination on the part of such men to take the same kind of leadership, or to speak with the same kind of an emphasis and authority on practical affairs, as they would when appealing directly to the human heart in the sphere of pure religion. We have not yet learned just where to draw the line so as to know when to speak with hesitation and when to speak with absolute certainty. When we address ourselves to the human heart we know exactly where we are. Within that special sphere there are certain elemental universal convictions. Every man can find them more or less distinct in his own consciousness. What we as the clergy have to do in the first place is to draw those feelings out, to insist they shall have their influence and authority. The life of the world tends to obscure those deeper experiences. We have a perfect right to say to men, with reference to those feelings, "You *shall* listen to them; you cannot escape from them; you have them within you; you *must* obey them." When addressing the world on that point we can do it with an absolute authority. There should be no wavering or hesitation in our utterances on this issue. We speak of what we know. We are devoting ourselves to calling forth the neg-

lected chords of religious feeling in the human soul. No man dare say to us under those circumstances that we do not know what we are talking about. We are the very persons who do understand that sphere of human life. We are justified for this reason in throwing into our utterances on that question the whole energy and emphasis that would come from absolute assurance.

But it is altogether different when we come to *apply* those elemental religious feelings to the every-day life of the world. It is not so easy for us to determine exactly in what way they should influence human action. It is perfectly certain that they ought to exert some kind of an effect on practical affairs. We cannot live with our feet on the earth and our souls in heaven. Either the life of the world or the life of the spirit is going to have the ascendancy. We shall be obliged, however, to look in an altogether different direction for the basis of our authority in applied religion. We do not draw our inspiration on this subject directly out of the human heart. It is largely a matter of personal experience. It is not so easy to decide at once what is exactly honest in business relations. We cannot assert on a moment's reflection what should be the true or normal conduct between laborer and employer. Who can say without a great deal of study and observation what is the best way to initiate reforms? We may say with Aristotle, "neither the evening nor the morning star is more beautiful than justice." But it would be another matter for us to specify always what would be the just act under particular conditions. At this point we shall often be obliged to turn to our own listeners for guidance and suggestions. We may have to say to the laity, "Give us of your practical experience; tell us of the measures you have tried, let us know of your success and your failures. What do *you* think could be done?"

It is quite true, this would bring us down to a much more commonplace level. We are no longer on the superior plane of keener insight or wider knowledge. We stand humbly waiting for guidance. We desire to be told what to do. Furthermore, if we take this attitude it is quite certain that

people will not listen to us with the same kind of awe as before. There is a special power that always goes with perfect assurance. A man who can speak with authority will induce men to listen to him with far greater respect for a length of time. But when they have once acted on his suggestions and found them a failure, he may have lost his influence forever.

We, as the clergy, do care to be reformers. We have no other purpose in life than just to be always urging men forward to higher methods and nobler human relations. It is for us to make men feel troubled and disturbed, just so that they may find the peace that comes alone of rectitude and loyalty to better ideals. We must be constantly telling men that they are wrong in their actions. It is equally true that if we do not indicate at times just when and where they have done the wrong and left undone the right, then our reminder becomes only a platitude. They will soon come to say over the words as they would count their beads, and have little thought that there are certain things which they really should or should not do in their personal or business relations. It is plain enough that in practical affairs human opinions as to what is just and what is unjust, is largely a matter of habit. If men do apply the rules of ethics, they do it only within the same old sphere. We are all scrupulous in certain directions and singularly unscrupulous in others. And the religious teacher has for his work to insist that men shall deepen and enlarge the scope of those rules, when applying them to their every-day affairs.

In applied religion the difference between us and the laity is not, therefore, in our superior judgment or insight. The contrast is rather in the *spirit* in which we work.

What should characterize us is that we care more for what is eternal than for what is ephemeral. We are more interested in that which is below the surface. It is the ideal which holds our enthusiasm. We are as much swayed in our feelings for the cause of the human race a thousand years hence, as for the welfare of our brothers in our own century. We are stirred over the extent to which justice is winning recognition, much more than by the variations in the world's material

prosperity. We do not belong to the makers of wealth. In the highest sense of the term we should neither be bread-winners nor money-makers. The vast majority of men must necessarily devote their attention to earning their living. The welfare of the race in the material sense justly requires the larger share of interest for the greater portion of the world. For that very reason it is natural and inevitable that the individuals whose cares are in that direction should be disposed to think too much of their personal needs or of their immediate difficulties. But on that account there should be one class of men constantly holding forward this peril, and insisting on the recognition of the Ideal in the obedience to Universal Law. They must be the Standard-Bearers of Justice and Right.

Unquestionably we as the clergy or ethical lecturers for that reason have a solemn and difficult task before us. The world must largely be against us in our efforts. It is not that men are instinctively opposed to the deeper interests. It is not that they would prefer to defy the Higher Law. But the very struggle for existence must to a certain degree compel them to be less devoted to those superior demands. We, above all others, therefore, must preserve the higher spirit; we, more than any other class, should be least concerned with making or accumulating wealth. We should have only one purpose or mission,—to uphold the life of the spirit.

What, then, are we going to do? The world wants to be let alone. It devolves upon us to induce men to apply the higher spirit, the universal law, to their immediate personal or business relations. We talk to them of righteousness on Sunday. They listen and approve; but they go on in the week-days doing just as before. We fail in our life-work if we do not exert a positive influence with this other spirit on the practical affairs of the world. The problem for us is, not whether it is to be done, but how to find our sphere of opportunity. Supreme attention at the present day, for example, is being called to the difficulties between the laborer and employer. The conditions are strained; the two classes cherish hard feelings toward one another; the chasm is becoming ever wider.

Selfishness and crime in one class encourage, if they do not compel, selfishness and crime in the other. What are we going to do toward breaking up this ill-will? How can we induce men under these conditions of distrust and anger to recognize the law of justice? If we confess that we can do nothing; if we acknowledge that there is no power in our mission or message to bridge over the chasm, to soften the feelings, to quicken the sense of human brotherhood, to overcome to some extent the attitude of strife; if we acknowledge that we can do nothing toward making men join hands in fellow-sympathy,—then we grant outright that religion can do nothing in the sphere of morality.

For my own part, I believe that we should talk on these practical subjects from the pulpit or the ethical platform on Sunday morning. The "Labor Problem" should be as much the text or subject of our sermons as the "Love of God" or "the Brotherhood of Christ." We know perfectly well that men will be concerned and anxious when we venture to do this. We are so liable to be mistaken! What is more, we shall be told that if we agitate these questions we are liable to disturb the social equilibrium. If we suffer men to think that they are being treated unjustly, they may exaggerate their condition and strike out wildly in the wrong direction for redress. It will be charged against us that we have been responsible for their mistakes. But it is forgotten that what we have to do is to tell men not that they are suffering injustice, but that they are *doing* injustice. This is a fact which the human mind does not like to face. Men will not think of it unless they are made to do so. They find it out more often only when it is too late and the sufferers have begun to seek to right their grievances in such unfortunate and often criminal ways. We would like to influence the laboring-class, to encourage them to higher methods, to loftier and more ideal purposes. We would be glad to awaken a deeper sense of responsibility among the wealth-owners of the world. Unless we can do this, it is perfectly certain that the methods of the wage-earners will become worse rather than better, and the

capitalist class be led to ever greater and greater repressive measures in order to preserve a temporary equilibrium.

People of wealth would like to have us influence the wage-earners by making them contented. They blame us because we do not do this; they think that we should inspire that element with loftier ideals. They would have us denounce the reckless methods of the proletariat. It is thought that we should raise our voice in warning and denunciation toward the crimes of the working-classes.

But if we do this, what is the result? The wage-earners say that we are speaking in the interest of the wealth-owners. They charge us with belonging to the upper classes; they tell us that we do not know the conditions; they assert that we are selfish or insincere; they believe that we care more to preserve our position than to improve the condition of our fellows. They suggest that we stay with our own class where we belong, and not to try to influence the vast element with which we have no sympathy or of whose interests we have no appreciation.

On the other hand, when speaking of the social problem to the wage-earners, the latter element would like to have us denounce the capitalists. They think that we should lay heavy stress on the crimes of corporations. They would have us constantly point out the selfishness of the wealth-owners. They think we should dwell on the oppression which the employer manifests toward the laborer. They are pleased and glad when we burn with indignation over the crimes of wealth. But if we do this, then the wealth-owners of the world accuse us of taking sides with the laboring-class. They tell us that we do not know what we are talking about, that we are pursuing a line of sentiment rather than a straight course of justice. It is suggested that we let the labor problem alone, and preach the Bible.

The perplexity is great. The difficulty for us as clergy or ethical lecturers is, that we cannot take up exclusively the cause of any one class; and yet it is so very hard to have any influence unless one class does recognize us as belonging just to themselves.

But there is one truth for us in this regard, fixed and everlasting. We cannot have influence where we do not show sympathy. This is the fact so easily forgotten by the well-to-do class, when they would have us influence the wage-earners. We cannot help that element unless we are privileged to acknowledge that *they have a cause* in their present struggle. It was an old, old law, expressed by George Eliot when she said, "Those who trust us educate us." Unless we can take the hand of the working-man and confess to him that he does not receive full justice; that he is right in a certain degree in his efforts to change his condition,—unless we can admit to some extent that there is a measure of oppression exercised toward him, we cannot make him listen to us. He will always be able to answer, "You do not understand, because you do not sympathize."

There is one kind of work which I do believe that we, as clergy, could do in the social problem. It would be by no means so great nor so dignified as might be the case if we could offer a definite solution to the difficulties. But the solution itself should not come from us, but rather from the men of affairs. It devolves upon us rather to bridge over the gulf of ill-will, to do what we can to quicken a larger sense of fellow-feeling and brotherhood, to compel both classes to feel that *something must be done*, and that whatever is done should be in the interest of permanent justice and not in order to escape an immediate difficulty. What the classes need above everything else is to know and understand one another. We could help, at least, in this particular direction. We ought to be the one body of men that come in contact with all the various strata of human society. We have no right to the name of religious teacher if we have not climbed the back-stairs of tenement-houses, or been at the door of the homes in the by-ways and alleys of our cities. The conditions are such at the present day that the two classes practically live in different sections of the community. They seldom or never come in contact with one another in their homes or their social life; they have no means of personal communication. They meet in business relations, they make contracts, buy and sell;

but they exchange no familiar look of recognition. They have not been in each others' homes, nor talked together by the same fireside. That is the only way, however, by which the classes ever can be known to one another. The clergyman should be the individual who has sat at all such firesides.

The pulpit could do a great work simply by explaining the attitude of mind and the conditions of life of the various elements of society. The clergy at the present day for the most part belong to the well-to-do class. For that reason they could do a great work in simply explaining the feelings and conditions of the wage-earners to the outside world. They could describe the homes and the way those people live; they could picture the conditions of life which they meet; they could tell both of its joys and its sorrows, its pleasures and its struggles. They could point out the restrictions in that kind of an existence. They could make it plain that such persons, whole families living in a few rooms, cannot have the same enlightened thoughts and wide experience which would come to others under healthier and happier conditions. People cannot be quite as sober and rational, who live in a tenement-house, as those who live in comfortable homes of their own. If they act at all, it cannot be as philosophers.

What is more, the clergy could explain the opinions and views of the working-people on the social problem. It is painful at the present time to see how little those opinions are understood by the most intelligent element of our large communities. The wage-earning class at the present day is doing a great deal of thinking. Their ideas may be very much confused; they may not be very rational or very logical; but they have their positive convictions. They even know something of political economy; occasionally they know a great deal. They are widely opposed to one another in their various measures; they offer very different solutions to the social problem. It would no more do to bring anarchism, the single tax, trades-unionism, and socialism together in the same chapter, under the one heading of "what the laboring-class are thinking of," than it would to bring together all the utterances or mad ravings of religious enthusiasts, and label them

"Christian thought." It is that confusion on the part of the upper classes which, by its very lack of sympathy, may by and by *drive* the wage-earners to a common attitude of mind. They may fuse together just because of their own isolation. These different theories stand not merely as rivals, but often in the strictest contradiction to one another. It is not so difficult a matter at the present day to get some clear understanding of these various social ideals, provided men will not take them second-, third-, or fourth-hand. It would be comparatively easy to read them in compact form. A pamphlet of sixty pages by Schaeffle, recently translated from the German, gives very clearly "The Quintessence of Socialism." It would not require a very long time to read "Progress and Poverty," and so have the stand-point of the "single tax." We can get the main ideas of trades-unionism from a single volume by Professor Richard Ely on the "Labor Movement in America."

It is true we may read these volumes only for the purpose of denouncing them and pointing out the mistakes in such opinions. But if we do not study a subject in order to learn something from it, it would be better to let it alone. Unless we can go to the thoughts of a certain class with some degree of sympathy, unless we can feel that there must be at least an element of truth in what they are thinking, it will do neither us nor them any good to make that kind of an investigation. We cannot help any person unless we can also learn something from him. We cannot exert an influence on the wage-earning class, unless we are satisfied that they have something to teach us, at the same time that we have something to give to them.

It strikes me, therefore, that, besides studying the works of abstract ethics and the doctrines of theology, we would do well to read the writings which stir the masses of the people,—that is to say, that we find out what is their Bible while studying our own Bible. We cannot at once reach their feelings or influence them, by quoting St. Paul when they do not read St. Paul, but give their attention to Bellamy, LaSalle, Carl Marx, or Henry George. I believe we should make those

writers the subjects of our sermons or addresses from the pulpit or the platform on Sunday morning. It may be said to us that such topics do not come within the sphere of religion. We shall be told that we are secularizing the pulpit if we address the people on subjects such as the "Ethics of Trades-Unionism" or the "Single Tax." But we must not forget that that is just what a certain class of people would like to think; because they could then regard their conduct in their business relations as secular, and, therefore, feel that they need not be disturbed in such matters by scruples of conscience or of religion. What we have to do is to make it plain that there is nothing secular,—that, in fact, the men who take that stand-point are committing a sacrilege in the sphere of religion. It is of tremendous consequence that we bring this labor problem under the influence of moral and religious considerations. We do this best by connecting it with the time and occasion when our thoughts are turned inward and upward to that which is highest and most sacred. It will be said to us that such topics do not inspire men with thoughts about Jesus or about God. We can only reply that a sermon could often be given which might not once mention the name of the Supreme Being, and yet be full to overflowing with the spirit of that Being. What did the great prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah talk about, if it was not the social problem? They rise to the loftiest heights of grandeur when they touch upon that theme. What, after all, was their ideal Israel, but a Social Ideal? What was the Sermon on the Mount, if not in part a discourse on the labor problem?

Our duty is in some way to exert a religious influence on the every-day life of the world. If we cannot do it in one way, then we should try another. If people will not listen to our Bible, then let us for a time make use of their Bible. We have to elevate human aspirations. If we can do it by talking about Carl Marx, let us do it through Carl Marx. By and by they may be willing to listen to us when we talk about a greater than Carl Marx. On the other hand, if we cannot make the upper classes understand and sympathize with the condition of the wage-earners or appreciate their

ideas and aspirations, by talking of Jesus, then let us rather pursue the method of the great Master himself and talk directly about those conditions. Let us give a little positive application to the "Sermon on the Mount."

If the opportunity offered, it would devolve upon us also to explain to the wage-earners what was the true attitude and feeling of the other class of society. The misunderstanding in this regard is equally great, though possibly more justifiable. The self-sacrificing spirit of reform, the longing to help and change the world, does not prevail exclusively among workingmen. Many a person of wealth would be willing to lay down all his possessions, if he could see just what it would avail to do so. Business men in numbers are considering all possible means and suggestions. Some of them would make any degree of sacrifice, provided they knew just what would be the true course to be pursued. Experiments in reform measures are being tried both in Europe and America. We of the clergy should watch these efforts with exceeding care. We should report them wherever it is possible. It is by these experiments made both by wage-earners and capitalists, that the final solution is to be discovered. It is essential above everything else that people rid themselves of the habit of taking any particular set of views or feelings as representing any one whole class. If the clergy would exert a part of their efforts in doing nothing more than explaining to the public the condition and work and opinions of the separated classes, they could feel that they had achieved a vast result in the great cause of reform.

It will be said, and with a certain degree of truth, that we are taking sides. This result will be almost inevitable. We *must* lean a little toward the wage-earning class. From the earliest dawn of history it has been the recognized duty of the religious teacher to espouse the cause of the weak. This would not imply that he should justify them in their methods, encourage them in their errors, or quicken their sense of oppression. It only means that he should make it his first consideration to appreciate the situation of the under classes. They are "the weak." They are the least liable to be under-

stood. Unfortunately they only half understand themselves. They make their own cause suffer, by not being able to express themselves clearly. They talk through their emotions. Their restlessness speaks, more often than their philosophy. It is impossible to come directly into their thought or opinions just by taking their words as we read them. At the present time, however, it is being said that the wage-earning class should rather be considered as belonging not to the weak but to the strong. It is asserted, and with a certain degree of truth, that they too exercise tyranny and oppression. By their united effort undoubtedly they are becoming a power for good or for evil. Nevertheless, in the long run the non-possessing class is liable to be beaten in their struggles unless the world is guided by loftier motives. Men cannot hold out long without capital in reserve. The wage-earners are the weaker class by their very lack of experience. Their power is short-lived. Hunger is sure to make them succumb. The clergymen should espouse their cause, not by joining with them directly in their efforts, but by trying to understand them, and then later on by explaining them, truly and sympathetically, to the other class of society. It is not a question of agreement or disagreement with their social theories. That is a second consideration. The first and supreme requisite just now is, that the under stratum should be understood and explained to the world by the one class of men who are least concerned in using their blood or muscle as a means of profit or money-accumulation.

We do not by any means imply that the ethical lecturers or the clergy should be continually giving their opinions on the social problem. We are not called upon, at every occasion, to give our views. We may know very often that our judgment should not be expressed, for the very reason that it is not based on thorough or wide experience or information. There are times, however, when we are bound to take our lives in our hands. We may have mastered the subject; we may be perfectly sure of the facts before us; we may be clear as to the laws of history. When a crisis occurs, the classes tend on both sides to lose consciousness of right. At that time

selfishness is always very strong. Every man is in a tremor lest he lose his position or his property. Justice is liable to be forgotten. Men think at that time largely only of their own. At such an hour the clergy ought to speak and say what they think, though it shipwreck them forever. They are the one remnant of society who, at such a crisis, by their interests and profession, should keep the public from losing sight of the fact that justice is of greater consequence than material welfare or prosperity. Emerson was right on that point: "If there are inconveniences and what is called ruin in the way, because we have so enervated and maimed ourselves; yet it would be like dying of perfumes to sink in the effort to readjust the deeds of every-day life to the holy and mysterious recesses of existence."

The true religious teacher, to my mind, never can receive that peculiar sympathy which befalls the man of generous deeds and kindly heart, who simply goes about doing good. He has to be a judge as well as a "brother of mercy." He is compelled now and then to say, "Thou art the man." It may fall upon him to tell his listener, "Thou art thy brother's keeper." The world will not like to be told those unpleasant truths. The man who does it, takes his life in his hands. He must do it with the greatest caution, and very rarely. It will not do to be over-dramatic. The individual who does the true religious teacher's work will always tend to have that inward pressure of the lips, which implies the peculiar reliance he has on his ideals and on their immutable worth, though he walks alone and has few sympathizers. Every true pulpit teacher ought to have in him the elements of Marcus Aurelius and Savonarola.

We might say that the supreme work for the pulpit on the labor problem should be, *to explain and point out the symptoms* rather than to suggest the remedy or cure. He must lay his finger on the wrong. It is for him to dwell on the injustice which is being done. He can tell the world what will be the inevitable result of these acts on all human society. It requires one kind of man to discover and recognize an evil, and another kind to suggest the measures for its removal. The

agitation which is going on implies something more than the particular remedy which is being sought after by the wage-earning class. Socialism, communism, and anarchism indicate certain symptoms of heart and character in all classes of society. We do not root them out by argument. We only get at them by getting at the conditions which called them into existence. What the clergy need to do is to discover and unfold the causes, while they urge the need of a remedy. It is a discovery, of course, which can only be made by direct contact with the world. The labor agitator and the capitalist are both in a certain way products of social conditions. We can say distinctly that under given circumstances in human society at any time in history, a certain general tendency or attitude of mind will arise. We can, therefore, suggest to the men of affairs to some extent what are those elemental causes. They are to be traced and recognized all through the past. The symptoms were as manifest in early times as they are to-day. We can say to the leaders who control events in the every-day world: "These are the conditions; here is the wrong; this is the law of history. It devolves upon you as the men of affairs to find the remedy."

I believe we, as the clergy, make a mistake, however, if we venture to take the personal leadership in reform movements. There is a certain kind of experience we can never possess. We shall always tend to be men of thought rather than men of action. Suspicion will always be upon us that we do not know the world. We must constantly, persistently, urge measures of reform; but there is always a point where we should hand the leadership over to the men of affairs who can do the work; we should keep ourselves in the background. We may as well accept it first as last that the world will not receive us as practical leaders. We can fire the spirit. We can point out the necessity. We may even suggest a direction. But it must devolve upon others to determine how the measure is to be carried out. As for us, we are to initiate the movement, to induce men to care for reforms.

It is no light duty for us to do even this simple kind of work. Men do not like to face disagreeable facts. They

would rather go on as before. When they think of such matters it gives them a tremor of uneasiness for the stability of society. If a remedy is to be found, we must first point out what is the ailment. What we need to do is to *study and explain the conditions*. The solution of the difficulty is being offered too soon. The physicians of society have first to describe the case and make it very clear just where is the seat of the wrong.

It is difficult and painful enough to talk upon this subject to the established classes of society. The people of wealth do not care to hear the story. But it is even more serious and embarrassing for us to tell the plain truth to the wage-earning classes. The message we have to give them is not palatable. We may remind the rich of their responsibility. But we have to say to the working-man in equally positive words, "you, too, are looking for the causes of the evil in the wrong direction." That particular element of society is saturated with the conviction that the conditions make the man. And therefore they care above everything else to change outside conditions. As an individual once said to me, "There is no use talking about ethics when wages are so low." We as the clergy or the ethical lecturers, on the other hand, must call the attention of those persons to the fact that outward conditions also depend largely on inward character. I was asked once at a meeting, "Do you not think that the selfishness of to-day is due to the present commercial system?" I did so much want to answer "Yes," for the sake of showing my sympathy. But as a religious teacher I had to give him the inevitable reply, "No; the present commercial system is rather the product of human selfishness."

What can we do to bring this truth home to the working-man? He does not know it, and he will not believe it. We have discovered it only too plainly through all past history. It has become a commonplace assertion among the clergy. We desire to tell that struggling class, "You also in part make your own conditions." We wish to remind them that there is no use in reforming *external* institutions, if a like reform does not take place in the inward character. But there is

no use in saying this to them if they will not take it home. We gain nothing by exasperating them. They know very little about history; but they are quite conscious that there is a world of difference between their own environment and that of the other classes of society. It will not do for us to be too bold in urging contentment and surrender. The clergy themselves for the most part live in comparative comfort. We do not know what would be our state of mind if we were living in the condition of the wage-earner. Only the man who has himself endured is able to influence other men to a like heroic endurance. It was the Man on the Cross alone who could deliver the Sermon on the Mount.

It is right here, no doubt, that the pulpit tends to lose its hold on the wage-earning class. That element of society comes back to us with the query, "Have you ever lived with your family, your wife and children, on a dollar and a half or two dollars a day? Do you know what it is to live, work, eat, and sleep in one or two rooms? Does it never affect your fineness of character or depth of sympathy, or your fellow-feeling, when your personal income is reduced? You tell us that we should care for higher character in spite of the conditions of our environment. Possibly it is true. But we see only too plainly how often it happens that when the refined individual is brought down to our position in life, he too adopts our level of interests. If you can show us that you too can be quite indifferent to the influences of such conditions, we will walk in your footsteps and follow your example." The charge is correct. We can never altogether escape it. We are not able to assert that if we were in their position we would not have exactly the same thoughts and take precisely the same attitude of mind. The clergy, just because they must belong to both classes, cannot take up the life of either one or the other. They could not live and do their work on two dollars a day. Nevertheless, so long as that is the case, they must to a degree be paralyzed in their efforts to reach the lower stratum of society.

We touch at this point the most delicate question in the whole social problem. Who are to be the coming religious

leaders of the wage-earning class? What kind of a person would be able to take to them the gospel which they need, and at the same time to command their sympathy and attention? They are disposed to listen only to men of their own number. This is perfectly natural. It would seem for that very reason that the true guide should appear from their own class. And yet there is one great difficulty. It was different matter a thousand years ago to be a teacher of the poor. At that time all that could be done was to urge endurance and passive submission. The religious teacher could only plead with them to keep the heart firm while nothing could be done to change the conditions. It required little experience to proclaim that truth. It was a gospel to be found in each man's own heart. They had to submit, because nothing could be done. The humblest and most ignorant person could urge that lesson, just as truly and completely as the man of great learning or the most profound philosopher. But to-day the circumstances are different. There is the conviction, strong and definite, that now something positive could be done. It is no longer at the present moment simply a question of passive and heroic endurance. The leader must now suggest to that class of men what shall be their associated efforts, how shall they act together, what methods and principles shall they adopt in order to improve their own condition. It would imply that such a person, if he is to be a wise and safe leader, should be a man of affairs who had dealt with masses of men, who had insight into character, and was acquainted with the laws of history. He should know of other efforts and movements; he should be familiar with past failures. It would require, indeed, a combination of qualities and experience possessed by the president of some vast business corporation, such as Mr. Rockefeller, the learning in sociological science of Herbert Spencer, the religious spirit of Luther, the insight into character of a George Eliot, and the self-sacrifice and devotion of a Father Damien.

The wage-earning class is convinced now that they can do something to improve their condition. They are groping in many ways to find the methods. Wise men of the world

look askance and tremble at their mistakes. Who shall be their leader and give them the true kind of inspiration? There was a time when I looked for the possible coming of a "Felix Holt." He was to me the one only solution,—a man born of the people, who earned his daily bread, gifted with superior intelligence, but with that sympathy for his class, which could make him say: "The fact is, there are not many easy lots to be drawn in the world at present; and such as they are, I am not envious of them. As it is, I prefer going shares with the unlucky. I would never choose to withdraw myself from the labor and common burden of the world, but I do choose to withdraw myself from the push and the scramble for money and position. I am a man of this generation. I'll try to make life less bitter for the few within my reach."

This would have been the ideal for a labor leader a thousand years ago. We would have the picture of a man capable of rising to prominence and power in the world, who yet chooses to stay with his own class, and to live just as they live, in order to be their helper. But there would be the one great difficulty. It is not enough to have the superior intellect, the self-sacrificing devotion, the true and perfect spirit; it is essential that the new leaders should be men of wide learning and great practical experience. When we consider the delicate and complicated questions at the present time to be settled or acted upon by the labor leaders, it is astonishing that they do not make even more mistakes.

My hope as a religious teacher lies in another direction. It is in the possibility of a second coming of men somewhat of the type of St. Francis of Assisi; that is to say, men who have lived the life of the world, done great work, equipped themselves with knowledge and experience, gifted with insight and judgment, eminent for wealth and social position,—who may sacrifice their personal opportunities, abandon their station in the world, and go down to apply their gifts and acquirements to the cause of the lower stratum of society. They would have to be so qualified as to lose nothing in delicacy or refinement of character, while they would be required to live to the very end of their days the life of the humble and the poor. It

would demand unusual physical and intellectual strength for them to experience that change and endure all those conditions. But if they could do it, if they could go down there and live in that way, as the working-man lives,—so winning his sympathy and confidence, trusted by him as well as by the class from which they came,—they might be able to inaugurate a movement that could transform and elevate the efforts of that wage-earning element, which is now groping so blindly for its own amelioration. That class will not accept guidance unless they first have received sympathy; and the guide himself can accomplish nothing unless he be acquainted, by study and experience, with present social conditions and the laws of past history.

Whether this other kind of leader will come, we cannot say. For the present we can only hope for a partial solution of the difficulties. We, as the clergy, would like to do so much, and yet are conscious that we can do so little! We must venture ahead slowly. An almost unexplored sea is before us. We know perfectly well what may be the chart for the feelings of the individual soul. But the chart for human action, in its delicate and ever-widening complications, is hard for us to read. The literature of the past does not help us very far forward. It points out the direction. But to know what to do in order to aid in the long, slow voyage of human society to its goal, must give us much weary thinking. We never doubt that the goal is there; we are sure that justice must be the guiding star. But how to apply the chart, how to find the true method to ever keep that star in view,—all this is no easy task. Nevertheless, it is equally certain that if we as the clergy or as ethical lecturers do not push on ahead,—if we do not insist and insist that the work has to be done,—if we do not stand to the work ourselves, whatever others may or may not do,—if we do not begin to apply these religious feelings to the actual world, then we have failed in our mission. We must make the effort until the better leader comes. When he appears, we can lay down the mantle and give it to other shoulders.

W. L. SHELDON.